

have had continuing resolutions. It looks to me like before the week is up we may need a continuing resolution for a continuing resolution, and on this one it looks to me like we are going to have to invent a new device, which is a continuing supplemental. So go the perils of Pauline, I guess.

I find this very regrettable. I hope that the House will be able to find some way out of it by the time the day is over. There is no reason why this supplemental should be held up because of extraneous causes.

I am confused about why this specific resolution is before us at this time, however, because certainly I share the view of the gentleman from Louisiana, the chairman of the committee, that it is highly unlikely that there will even be a supplemental vehicle that will ride along after this rule. So if we are interested in resolving the problem, I think we are going to need a lot of other action, including a speed-up of the Senate schedule, which I fully do not expect to see.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, let me just say that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] and I had discussed, we had originally expected to bring a rule to the floor dealing only with the budget. However, because of great concerns, some of which the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] has just stated, it was thought we would just add the supplemental to it as well.

Having said this, we are far past our minute. We need to get on with the work of the day. I would suggest that the gentleman has used more than his minute. Let us get on with the rule before us.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

#### WAIVING A REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 4(b) OF RULE XI WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED FROM THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 155 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 155

*Resolved*, That the requirement of clause 4(b) of rule XI for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported before May 23, 1997, providing for consideration or disposition of any of the following measures:

(1) A concurrent resolution on the budget, an amendment thereto, a conference report thereon, or an amendment reported in disagreement from a conference thereon.

(2) The bill (H.R. 1469) making emergency supplemental appropriations for recovery from natural disasters, and for overseas peacekeeping efforts, including those in Bosnia, for the fiscal year ending September

30, 1997, and for other purposes, an amendment thereto, a conference report thereon, or an amendment reported in disagreement from a conference thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina). The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized for one hour.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Rules, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for purposes of debate only.

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, this rule is very straightforward and simple. As has actually just been discussed in the extended 1-minute we just had, it waves clause 4(b) of rule XI, which requires a two-thirds vote to consider a rule on the same day it is reported. That is all it does.

In this case the exemption is very narrow, as it applies to two specific measures, the fiscal year 1998 budget resolution conference report and the emergency supplemental bill, as we just heard in the colloquy between the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from New York.

In an effort to avoid postponement of the Memorial Day work period restriction, when many Members obviously have important things to do back in their districts, this rule will allow for expedited consideration of these two important items. That is the purpose of the rule, and nothing more sinister than that.

Negotiations over several extraneous items in the emergency bill have, unfortunately, delayed timely release of these funds, and I remain hopeful, if not optimistic, that we will be able to get this bill to the President's desk before the weekend. I think we all share that.

I understand that the budget agreement had been strained in the other body by the proposed addition of a brand new Federal entitlement program paid for in tax increases. I hope that the irony of our balanced budget agreement being held hostage by unlimited spending and higher taxes will not be lost on most American people.

But that is where we are, as we just hear in the extended 1-minute colloquy. In order to be able to move these critical items in a timely fashion, the House needs the targeted authority covered in this resolution, again, the targeted limited authority. We frankly need to be prepared to go forward as expeditiously as possible when that is possible.

It is an ounce of prevention we are taking at this point. I think it is the responsible thing to do under the important and somewhat extraordinary circumstances we find ourselves in on the threshold of Memorial Day.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the resolution and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this two-thirds rule. Today's rule will allow my Republican colleagues to rush two very important bills to the House floor. I believe we should do everything in our power to make sure the Midwestern flood relief gets out of Washington and into the hands of the people who need it the most as soon as possible.

I also believe that this House should have completed its work on the budget over a month ago, when it was actually due. But since no one has even laid eyes on the final version of the two bills under question, I just cannot lend my support to a rule rushing their consideration because I am not sure what else is in those bills. They do not exist, Mr. Speaker. I am not sure what has been put into these bills, particularly given the unabashedly partisan provisions that were added to the supplemental appropriations bill, provisions that all but ensure its doom.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make something perfectly clear. There is no problem, no problem at all, with the flood relief money for North Dakota. There is no problem, no problem at all, with the money for our troops in Bosnia. There is no problem with any of the emergency money in this bill, so why did it take so long to get this bill out of conference? Why did we have to do this rule today, waiving the two-thirds requirement for the same day consideration of the rule?

Because, Mr. Speaker, Republican colleagues insist on holding the Midwest flood money hostage in order to make a political point. Despite the complete devastation of towns like Red Forks, ND, my Republican colleagues still refuse to do what they should do, let this emergency relief go forward.

Even though the flooding is over and the fires are put out, Mr. Speaker, hundreds of people are still without their homes, without their belongings, without their businesses. These are the people, Mr. Speaker, that are waiting for our help. We should give it to them. We should give it to them as soon as possible. We should not attach political blackmail to a bill this urgent and a bill with this much support.

Weeks ago President Clinton warned that he would veto a bill with automatic continuing resolution because he believes, and I agree, that my Republican colleagues should fulfill their constitutionally mandated responsibilities to pass the appropriation bills by October 1, and not close down the Government for silly political gains.

But they have attached the automatic continuing resolution anyway. Today they want to bring it to the House floor without giving Members enough time to find out exactly what is in it that they are voting on. But my Republican colleagues want to get out

of Washington for the Memorial Day recess, and they will not drop this political blackmail.

For my Republican colleagues to consider going away for Memorial Day when these people are waiting for their flood relief money, which absolutely nobody opposes, is disgraceful.

Mr. Speaker, simply and plainly, the people in North Dakota need our help. They do not need anymore political gains, they need our help. I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1230

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I would again remind our colleagues that this is a rule to keep our options open.

It does nothing except change the two-thirds vote requirement, and any further measure that would have to come forward would have to be covered by another rule which, of course, the distinguished gentleman from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, as the ranking member of the Committee on Rules, would have significant input in the shaping in order that we could get the best possible job done.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, who can expand further on this rule we are discussing today.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I had not even intended to speak, but I was moved by the ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules, the former chairman of that committee, whose place I took. And I must say, I learned an awful lot from him over the preceding decade when he was the chairman, but he talks about this continuing resolution and how the President has vowed to veto the continuing resolution.

Well, just briefly we ought to discuss what is a continuing resolution. Let us digress for a minute. If Members recall, a couple years ago, when the Republicans and Democrats could not get together, they could not come to an agreement. Consequently, various departments of Government were not funded when the fiscal year began on September 30. And when that happens, if the Congress has not authorized and appropriated the money for the operation of these departments, those departments shut down.

That is what happened, and it was a great inconvenience to many Americans. Many of them, if they were waiting for passports to be expedited, they could not get them. If they have reservations on airways and boats, many of them, because they did not have their passports, they lost their tickets. They could not get refunds. That was just one area.

In the IRS, many people were waiting for refunds from the Government and they did not get them on time. If they were visiting Washington, the Wash-

ington Monument or if they were going into the various State parks, one of them is like the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Park and the Vanderbilt mansion up in Hyde Park, NY, they could not operate. People were hurting; the areas were hurt in tourism. And so we decided right then and there, we ought to do something about that.

If we cannot get together, then we ought to make some provision to keep the Government operating, if we and the President cannot come to an agreement.

Well, that is exactly what this debate is all about. Sometime between now and September 30, we will have to act on the appropriation bills that fund the various 13 departments of Government across this country.

And should one or two of those not be agreed to, then this continuing resolution would continue to keep those departments operating, keep those very, very good Federal workers at their jobs getting their paychecks each month until the Congress could come to an agreement. That is what this debate is all about.

Now, if the President wants to veto this bill simply because it has this continuing resolution, then let the President be responsible to the American people and to these Federal workers for having shut down the Government. I do not think he should do that.

And, second, I really think he is bluffing. I do not think he will veto this bill for that reason. That, to me, would be a disgrace.

So, having said that, let us get on with this resolution. Let us pass it. We are prepared to yield back our time, if the gentleman is, and get on with the day's business.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say that I am a little puzzled. We just went from a hard-fought battle on adjournment, at the gentleman's request over there, which we beat back.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I told the gentleman from Florida that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], sitting over there, looks like Santa Claus and not the Grinch that stole Christmas. I still think he is Santa Claus.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts, who could be misidentified as Santa Claus.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to be compared with Santa Claus. I hope the gentleman is not referring to my girth.

I think that the gentleman from Florida and the gentleman from New York and myself have adequately described this, and, thus, I have yielded back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### DRUG-FREE COMMUNITIES ACT OF 1997

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 956, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. PORTMAN] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 956, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

Without objection, a vote on the Journal, if called, will be a 5-minute vote.

There was no objection.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 420, nays 1, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 153]

YEAS—420

Abercrombie	Chambliss	Everett
Ackerman	Chenoweth	Ewing
Aderholt	Christensen	Farr
Archer	Clay	Fattah
Armey	Clayton	Fawell
Bachus	Clement	Fazio
Baesler	Clyburn	Filner
Baker	Coble	Flake
Baldacci	Coburn	Foglietta
Ballenger	Collins	Foley
Barcia	Combest	Forbes
Barr	Condit	Ford
Barrett (NE)	Conyers	Fowler
Barrett (WI)	Cook	Fox
Bartlett	Cooksey	Frank (MA)
Barton	Costello	Franks (NJ)
Bass	Cox	Frelinghuysen
Bateman	Coyne	Frost
Becerra	Cramer	Furse
Bentsen	Crane	Galleghy
Bereuter	Crapo	Ganske
Berman	Cubin	Gejdenson
Berry	Cummings	Gekas
Bilbray	Cunningham	Gephardt
Bilirakis	Danner	Gibbons
Bishop	Davis (FL)	Gilchrest
Blagojevich	Davis (IL)	Gillmor
Bliley	Davis (VA)	Gilman
Blumenauer	Deal	Gonzalez
Blunt	DeFazio	Goode
Boehlert	DeGette	Goodlatte
Boehner	Delahunt	Goodling
Bonilla	DeLauro	Gordon
Bonior	DeLay	Goss
Bono	Dellums	Graham
Borski	Diaz-Balart	Granger
Boswell	Dickey	Green
Boucher	Dicks	Greenwood
Boyd	Dingell	Gutierrez
Brady	Dixon	Gutknecht
Brown (CA)	Doggett	Hall (OH)
Brown (FL)	Dooley	Hall (TX)
Brown (OH)	Doolittle	Hamilton
Bryant	Doyle	Hansen
Bunning	Dreier	Harman
Burr	Duncan	Hastert
Buyer	Dunn	Hastings (FL)
Callahan	Edwards	Hastings (WA)
Calvert	Ehlers	Hayworth
Camp	Ehrlich	Hefley
Campbell	Emerson	Hefner
Canady	Engel	Herger
Capps	English	Hill
Cardin	Ensign	Hilleary
Carson	Eshoo	Hilliard
Castle	Etheridge	Hinchee
Chabot	Evans	Hinojosa